

1
2
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
4 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

5 * * *

6 VACLAV ONDRISEK, et al.,
7 Plaintiffs,
8 v.
9 US IMMIGRATION SERVICES,
10 Defendant.
11

Case No. 2:18-cv-00411-APG-CWH

ORDER

12 Presently before the court is plaintiffs' first amended complaint (ECF No. 8), filed on July
13 18, 2018.

14 Plaintiffs commenced this action on a pro se basis. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. §
15 1915(e)(2), upon granting plaintiffs' request to proceed *in forma pauperis*, the court screened
16 plaintiffs' complaint. (Screening Order (ECF No. 3).) Plaintiffs subsequently were appointed
17 counsel through the court's pro bono program. (Order (ECF No. 5); Order (ECF No. 6).) Pro
18 bono counsel filed the amended complaint. (Am. Compl. (ECF No. 8).) Given that the concerns
19 underlying the screening requirement of § 1915(e) are obviated by the fact plaintiffs are
20 represented by counsel, the court finds it is not in the interests of judicial economy to screen the
21 amended complaint. The court therefore will not enter a screening order on the amended
22 complaint. This case shall proceed on the normal litigation track as governed by the Federal
23 Rules of Civil Procedure.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 DATED: July 19, 2018

26
27 
28 C.W. HOFFMAN, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE